

REMARKS

These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the office action are shown indented and italicized.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the application filed 06/22/2007 and the preliminary amendment filed 04/01/2008.

Claim 1 is presented for examination.

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Drawings

2. The drawings filed 07/27/2006 are accepted by the examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- *“one computing environment. “(page 2/6, line 8) should read “one computing Environment”*
- *“said group” (page 2/6, line 19) should read ‘said group of provisioning resource services”*
- *“each base resource instance’ (page 3/6, line 2) should read “said base resource instance”*
- *“each composite resource instance’ (page 3/6, line 6) should read “said composite resource instance”*
- *“the description of the computing environment’ (page 4/6, line 5) should read “the description of the at least one computing environment”*

Appropriate correction is required.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that claim 1 is amended to implement all the informalities indicated above. This overcomes the objections to claim 1 because of informalities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following terms lack antecedent basis:

- “the resources’ (page 4/6, line 3)
- “the plans” (page 4/6, lines 12-13)
- “the set of base resource types’ (page 4/6, line 16)
- “the set of composite resource types” (page 4/6, line 16)

In response, the applicants respectfully states that all the terms of claim 1, listed above are amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

The following claim limitations are indefinite:

- “base resources” (page 3/6, line 18) renders the claim indefinite. It is unclear if it is referring to “said base resources” (page 3/6, line 17)
- “at least one managed resource service” (page 5/6, line 4) renders the claim indefinite. It is unclear if it is referring to “said managed resource service” (page 3/6, line 7)

In response, the applicants respectfully states that claim 1 is further amended to make it clear and definite. This overcomes the rejection of claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 as amended is definite and particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 1 appears to be allowable over the prior art of record, subject to the objections, the 112 rejections detailed above, and subject to a final search.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome the objections and 112 rejections. Thus, it is anticipated that this amendment brings claim 1 to allowance. If any questions remain, please contact the undersigned representative before issuing a FINAL action.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____/Louis Herzberg/_____
Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
Reg. No. 41,500
Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194
Fax. (845) 352-3194

3 Cloverdale Lane
Monsey, NY 10952

Customer Number: 54856